

**WAYZATA PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 4, 2016**

AGENDA ITEM 1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Iverson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present at roll call were Commissioners: Young, Gruber, Gonazalez, Iverson, Murray and Flannigan. Absent and excused: Commissioner Gnos. Director of Planning and Building Jeff Thomson and City Attorney David Schelzel were also present.

a.) Approval of the December 7th Planning Commission Minutes

Commissioner Gonzalez made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Gruber, to approve the December 7, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

b.) Approval of the December 21st Planning Commission Minutes

Commissioner Gruber stated on page 3, line 32, the word “widows” should be changed to “windows”.

Commissioner Gruber made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Gonzalez, to approve the December 21, 2015 Planning Commission Minutes as presented with Commissioner Gruber’s change. The motion carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 2. Regular Agenda Public Hearing Items:

a.) Holdridge Homes – 1405, 1407 and unaddressed parcel on Holdridge Terrace

i. PUD Rezoning, Concurrent PUD Concept Plan and General Plan of Development, Preliminary Plat

Mr. Thomson stated the applicant and property owner, Lake West Development, LLC has submitted a Development Application requesting rezoning from R-2/Medium Density Single Family Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development, Concurrent PUD Concept Plan and General Plan Development approval, and preliminary plat review to subdivide the properties at 1405 and 1407 Holdridge Terrace, and an unaddressed parcel on Holdridge Terrace for a seven (7) lot single-family residential development. He stated the density would be consistent with the current Comprehensive Plan land use designation for this property. He reviewed the plans submitted with the Development Application. Mr. Thomson stated the Applicant would provide an extension to the sewer and water to provide services to all six (6) of the newly formed lots. He reviewed proposed Project and compared the plans to the R-2 lot standards and setback requirements. He explained the purpose of a PUD as outlined in City Ordinance 801.33.1.

1
2 Commissioner Gonzalez asked what the proposed side yard setback between the homes would be
3 and if lot coverage information had been provided.

4
5 Mr. Thomson stated the side yard setback varies between the lots from 16 feet to 5 feet. The
6 specific home footprints have not been provided but based on the impervious surface
7 calculations, the lots would comply with the City's lot coverage requirements.

8
9 Chair Iverson asked if heights for the homes had been provided.

10
11 Mr. Thomson stated the specific building heights are not indicated on the plans, and the Planning
12 Commission could request this information be provided when the Commission reviews the
13 project again.

14
15 Commissioner Gonzalez asked how much fill the Applicant planned on bringing to the site. She
16 also stated that the information provided by the Applicant was difficult to read, and she requested
17 that future applications provide more legible information for review.

18
19 Chair Iverson stated based on her calculations, approximately 300 truckloads would be removed
20 from the site and 40,000 cubic feet of dirt would need to be brought to the site.

21
22 Commissioner Gruber asked if the proposed homes would be on slabs or have foundations.

23
24 Mr. Thomson stated based on the plans submitted the homes are proposed to have basements.

25
26 Mr. Reid Schultz, Landform Professional Services, 105 South 5th Avenue, Minneapolis, on
27 behalf of the Applicant, provided additional background on the property and why the Applicant
28 was back in front of the Planning Commission because a 3-lot subdivision was previously
29 approved. He reviewed architectural renderings of possible homes for the properties. He
30 explained the homes were proposed to be slanted in order to maximize the views of the wetlands
31 and screening from Wayzata Boulevard. The homes would have either lookout basements or
32 walkout basements. He explained the Wetland Plan provided with the Application does meet the
33 City's standards for wetland buffers. If the current wetland areas do not have adequate
34 vegetation, they would provide additional native vegetation and grasses to enhance the buffer.
35 Once the construction has been completed, signs would be posted indicating this was a wetland
36 area and residents could not mow the area.

37
38 Commissioner Gruber asked about the amount of trees that would be removed from the site.

39
40 Mr. Schultz stated the Application documents had been provided to the City electronically if the
41 Planning Commission needed to review these in greater detail. The Applicant is proposing
42 approximately 26% of the significant trees would be removed. Mr. Schultz stated this is less
43 than the tree loss that could occur if these lots were built on as they currently are arranged. He
44 noted with the PUD process, the Planning Commission and City Council does have the ability to
45 limit the amount of tree loss. He stated this proposal provides more affordable housing in
46 Wayzata.

1
2 Commissioner Flannigan asked what the proposed homes would be valued at, and if a builder
3 had been selected for the Project.

4
5 Mr. Schultz stated the home values have not been determined yet and they have not identified a
6 builder at this time.

7
8 Chair Iverson opened the public hearing at 7:32 p.m.

9
10 Ms. Merrily Babcock, 337 Reno Street, Wayzata, stated she had been unable to read the tree
11 survey provided with the Application, and had been unable to get a larger copy at City Hall. She
12 stated 116 or approximately 50% of the trees marked on the survey are Ash trees that would die
13 due to the Emerald Ash Borer, and this is in addition to the 26% they are proposing to remove.
14 She stated that the Applicant is proposing to remove trees that include a 42-inch oak tree that
15 would be 250-300 years old, a 25-inch oak, 30-inch oak, 33-inch cottonwood tree, 24-inch
16 cottonwood tree, 27-inch cottonwood tree, and a 20-inch cottonwood tree. If the Applicant is
17 bringing in as much fill as they are proposing, she does not see a plan to protect other trees. She
18 stated that this is the entrance to Wayzata, and if this is substandard building where only the
19 backs of the homes would be seen, it would not be improving Wayzata. She recommended the
20 Planning Commission review the material on the homes, prior to any homes being constructed.
21 She asked who would police the wetland buffer once the project was complete to ensure the
22 wetlands are protected. She stated there is a stream on this property, and she does not see where
23 the Applicant has taken this into consideration. She said there is a State Statute that swamps
24 cannot be filled, but it appears this is what the Applicant would be doing with the fill that is
25 brought in and there are no mitigation methods in place. The removal of all the trees would also
26 be degrading the neighborhood due to the gases and noise coming off the Highway.

27
28 Mr. Judd Nelson, 1515 Holdridge Terrace, Wayzata, stated he would like to see the DNR
29 involved with the protection of the wetlands on the property. He would like more clarification
30 on the prices of the proposed homes because they are saying they would be affordable, but they
31 do not know what they would be priced at. He also expressed concerns on the preservation of
32 the trees on the property because the more trees that are lost, the more noise there would be from
33 the highway.

34
35 Ms. Andrea Rey, 1409 Holdridge Terrace, Wayzata, expressed concerns about the density that
36 was being proposed, and the value of the homes that would be built. She said more houses will
37 increase the traffic and the more trees that are removed, the more noise they would have from the
38 highway.

39
40 Chair Iverson closed the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

41
42 Commissioner Gruber stated there are eight (8) provisions in the Zoning Ordinance that include
43 criteria for evaluating a proposed PUD. She stated she would not be able to make a
44 recommendation to the City Council until all of these have been addressed, and she has not heard
45 enough information from the Developer. She expressed concerns about the density, with seven
46 (7) homes proposed for the property. The Developer is only showing two (2) styles of homes

1 that would be built on these parcels, and she would like to see more variety. She also does not
2 like having the backs of the homes being seen as the entrance to Wayzata. She would like to see
3 more creativity from the Developer to meet the ordinance's criteria for a PUD.

4
5 Commissioner Gonzalez added that a PUD should not be used as a way to not comply with the
6 City's Zoning Regulations and Ordinances. She stated the Project is not in compliance with the
7 City's Comprehensive Plan for maintaining and enhancing tree coverage. The Applicant is
8 removing several trees, several of the Ash trees would be lost, and a number of trees would be
9 damaged due to the amount of fill brought onto the site. She stated she did like the use of shared
10 driveways to reduce hardcover but she had been unable to really evaluate the Application
11 because the copies provided were not legible. As the Application is presented, she would not
12 recommend approval; however, she had not been able to review all of the details of the
13 Application. She would like to have the tree preservation plan include details on how the
14 Applicant plans to protect those trees that would remain. She would also like to see a Landscape
15 Plan, and more details about the wetland buffer including covenants or easements.

16
17 Commissioner Young stated at this time he would not recommend approval because the
18 Application contains several deviations from the Zoning Ordinance, and does not meet the
19 standards for a PUD. The trees in this area are a significant benefit to the City, and he would not
20 support removing that many trees.

21
22 Commissioner Flannigan stated it is the Applicant's responsibility to know what they are
23 proposing and they are unable to provide the fair market value of the homes they are proposing
24 for these parcels. He stated that this is a part of what the Commission is considering.

25
26 Commissioner Murray stated the Application was less than aesthetically pleasing, and a couple
27 of the homes will be very close together. This Application does not fit in this area due to the loss
28 of trees and does not fit in with the current homes in the area.

29
30 Commissioner Young asked what would potentially happen on this site if there was not a PUD
31 approved.

32
33 Mr. Thomson stated the current lot configuration allows two (2) new homes to be constructed on
34 the properties, one on each lot, and potentially a third on the easterly lot. These homes would be
35 subject to the setback requirements and wetland requirements. They could potentially have a
36 larger footprint. He explained the impact on the trees may be less in this scenario because there
37 would be less units, but this would not be known until plans were presented.

38
39 Commissioner Gruber asked why the City originally zoned this area as R-2.

40
41 Mr. Nelson stated when Highway 12 was upgraded to Highway 394, the government took land
42 from this area.

43
44 Chair Iverson expressed concerns about the buildable use of these parcels, and stated there
45 should be additional work done with the DNR regarding the wetlands on the property. She
46 stated the PUD Ordinance also requires common open space, and there is no open space included

1 in the Application. She stated her biggest concerns are density and how close the homes are to
2 each other. She explained the Commission would like additional information on: the lot
3 coverage; height and square footage of the homes; value of the homes; the building materials; if
4 the homes would be rentals or owner occupied; the wetland buffer;; and noise impacts to the
5 neighboring homes once trees are removed. She also requested a larger set of plans, so that the
6 Commission can review the trees that would be removed, and a Landscape Plan. She asked if
7 the Applicant considered ways to layout the homes so that the garages were not shown. She also
8 asked the Applicant to provide additional information on how each of the provisions of the PUD
9 Ordinance are being met, and to provide a Tree Preservation Plan including protection of the
10 remaining trees.

11
12 Mr. Curt Fretham, Lake West Development, 14525 Highway 7, Minnetonka, for the Applicant,
13 stated they were looking at different development plans because these parcels are next to a
14 Highway. High density is usually located next to highways, but they had felt less density,
15 smaller, more affordable homes would be appropriate in this area. They have not decided on a
16 builder yet so he would be hesitant to put a value on the homes at this time, but would estimate
17 \$400,000 to \$600,000.

18
19 Mr. Thomson stated the Commission could direct staff to prepare a draft report and
20 recommendation to review and possibly adopt at their next meeting, or continue review and ask
21 the Applicant to come back with the additional information requested by the Commission during
22 this evening's meeting.

23
24 Commissioner Gruber made a motion, Seconded by Commissioner Gonzalez to continue the
25 Application to the next Planning Commission meeting to allow the Applicant time to provide the
26 additional information requested to the Commission. The motion carried unanimously.
27
28

29 **AGENDA ITEM 3. Regular Agenda Old Business Items:**

30
31 a.) None.
32
33

34 **AGENDA ITEM 4. Other Items:**

35
36 a.) **Review of Development Activities**
37

38 Mr. Thomson stated the agenda for the next Planning Commission meeting includes a review of
39 proposed changes to the Parking Ordinance. The next community Lake Effect meeting is
40 scheduled for January 12. The City Council is scheduled to review the design contract for the
41 Mill Street parking ramp at its January 5 meeting.
42

43 b.) **Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**
44

45 Mr. Thomson reviewed the process for electing the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning
46 Commission , as required under the Commission's bylaws.

1
2 Commissioner Gonzalez stated she would not like to be considered for either Chair or Vice Chair
3 position.

4
5 Commissioner Gruber nominated Commissioner Iverson as Chair.

6
7 Commissioner Iverson accepted the nomination.

8
9 Commissioner Gonzalez nominated Commissioner Gruber as Vice Chair.

10
11 Commissioner Gruber accepted the nomination.

12
13 Commissioner Flannigan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Murray to elect
14 Commissioner Iverson to serve as Chair. The motion carried unanimously.

15
16 Commissioner Young made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Murray to elect
17 Commissioner Gruber to serve as Vice Chair. The motion carried unanimously.

18
19 **c.) Other Items**

20
21 Mr. Thomson introduced new Planning Commissioners Murray and Flannigan.

22
23
24 **AGENDA ITEM 5. Adjournment.**

25
26 Commissioner Gruber made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Young, to adjourn the
27 meeting.

28
29 Commissioner Gonzalez asked who would attend the next Heritage Preservation Board meeting.

30
31 Commissioner Flannigan recommended a schedule be established for Commissioner's to attend
32 these meetings.

33
34 Chair Iverson suggested Mr. Thomson develop a schedule for Commissioners to attend the
35 Heritage Preservation Meetings.

36
37 Commissioner Gonzalez stated she would attend the next meeting.

38
39 The motion to adjourn was called to a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

40
41 The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

42
43 Respectfully submitted,

44
45 Tina Borg

46 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*